

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
v.)	Criminal Action Nos. 13-278 & 10-119
)	
JASON SHEPPARD,)	Judge Cathy Bissoon
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Defendant's Motions for early termination of supervised release (Doc. 289 in Cr. Action No. 13-278 & Doc. 260 in 10-119) will be denied.

To be sure, the alleged-conduct of Defendant's probation officer is unfortunate, and – if true – can be expected to result in significant adverse consequences for said officer. That being said, the one thing (the probation officer's alleged misconduct) has little to do with the other (whether Defendant should continue under the supervision of a different officer).

The purpose of supervised release is to assist Defendant in transitioning to community life. U.S. v. Cook, 775 Fed. Appx. 44, 48 (3d Cir. May 29, 2019) (citation to binding authority omitted). Defendant's Motions offer no persuasive explanation for why the purported misconduct of his former probation officer makes him less amenable to, or needful of, such assistance. In fact, defense counsel's only non-metaphysical argument actually *undermines* the request for early termination. *Compare* Doc. 289 in 13-278 at 1 (indicating that Defendant's therapist would testify "as to how Defendant's rehabilitation has been burdened by his [former] probation officer's conduct") *with* Judgment in 13-278 (Doc. 239) at pg. 5 (recognizing Defendant's need for mental health monitoring and treatment, having imposed it as a condition of supervised release).

Having reviewed all of the facts, circumstances and arguments-presented, the Court does not agree that early termination of supervised release is warranted, and Defendant's Motions (**Doc. 289** in **13-278** & **Doc. 260** in **10-119**) are **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

September 29, 2020

s/Cathy Bissoon
Cathy Bissoon
United States District Judge

cc (via ECF email notification):

All Counsel of Record